UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|
| 10/608,265 | 06/27/2003 | Ralph F. Kalies | 036806.00434 | 8330 | |
| Louis C. Dujmi | 7590 03/19/200 ch | EXAMINER | | | |
| Ostrolenk, Faber, Gerb & Soffen, LLP 1180 Avenue of the Americas New York, NY 10036-8403 | | | RANGREJ, SHEETAL | | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| , | | | 3626 | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 03/19/2008 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|------------------|--|--|
| 10/608,265 | KALIES, RALPH F. | | |
| | | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |

| | SHEETAL R. RANGREJ | 3626 | |
|---|---|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>19 February 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS . | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO | R ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v | r, or other evidence, whith 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date | of the final rejection. | | |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i hter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | date of the final rejection | n. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| | | | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, by (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti | nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); | E below); | |
| appeal; and/or | | | |
| (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | corresponding number of finally reje | cted claims. | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | | mpliant Amendment (l | PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all | | imely filed amendmer | nt canceling the |
| non-allowable claim(s). | | • | - |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | ☑ will not be entered, or b) ☑ will ided below or appended. | be entered and an ex | xplanation of |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u> . | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | l and/or appellant fail: | s to provide a |
| The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> | n of the status of the claims after en | try is below or attach | ed. |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowan | ce because: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet. | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| /C Luke Gilligan/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3626 | | | |

Continuation of 13. Other: The amendments to the claims presented in the reply filed February 19, 2008 specifying claims 1-14 require further consideration of the prior art and/or further search. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In the remarks/arguments filed February 19, 2008. Applicant argues that the claims more are distinguished over the Oscar, Ullman, Freeman, and Judge references. In addition, Applicant substantially rehashes the remarks/arguments presented in the previous response. Since the amendment After Final has not been entered, the remarks/arguments with respect to these changes are currently moot. In response to the remaining remarks/arguments, the Examiner incorporates the response to the remarks/arguments presented in the previous Office Action, mailed October 18, 2007.